

**Original citation:**

Chen, Yunfei, Sabnis-Thomas, Kalen and Abd-alhameed, Raed. (2016) New formula for conversion efficiency of RF EH and its wireless applications. IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology. doi : 10.1109/TVT.2016.2515843

**Permanent WRAP url:**

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/77006>

**Copyright and reuse:**

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

**Publisher's statement:**

“© 2016 IEEE. Personal use of this material is permitted. Permission from IEEE must be obtained for all other uses, in any current or future media, including reprinting /republishing this material for advertising or promotional purposes, creating new collective works, for resale or redistribution to servers or lists, or reuse of any copyrighted component of this work in other works.”

**A note on versions:**

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRAP url' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: [publications@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:publications@warwick.ac.uk)



<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk>

# New Formula for Conversion Efficiency of RF EH and its Wireless Applications

Yunfei Chen, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Kalen T. Sabnis, Raed A. Abd-Alhameed

**Abstract**—Existing works on energy harvesting wireless systems often assume a constant conversion efficiency for the energy harvester. In practice, the conversion efficiency often varies with the input power. In this work, based on a review of existing energy harvesters in the literature, a heuristic expression for the conversion efficiency as a function of the input power is derived by curve fitting. Using this function, two example energy harvesters are used to analyze the realistic performances of wireless relaying and wireless energy transfer. Numerical results show that the realistic performances of the wireless systems could be considerably different from what predicted by the existing analysis.

**Index Terms**—Energy harvesting, relaying, throughput, wireless energy transfer.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Energy efficiency is a long-standing problem in wireless communications [1], [2]. One of the most promising solutions is radio frequency (RF) energy harvesting (EH) [3]. The most important performance measure of the RF energy harvester is perhaps the conversion efficiency, defined as the ratio of the output power to the input power of the energy harvester. There have been quite a few different designs of RF energy harvester in the literature, such as [4] - [16], among others. A detailed discussion of these works will be presented in the next section, based on which a heuristic formula of the conversion efficiency will be obtained. In these designs, a common conclusion is that the conversion efficiency depends on the input power.

On the other hand, many researchers have studied the use of energy harvesting in wireless systems. For example, in [17], an energy-constrained wireless link was studied, where the receiver relies on harvesting the energy from the transmitter, by maximizing the throughput. In [18], an energy harvesting relaying system was studied. Two energy harvesting methods, time-switching (TS) and power-splitting (PS), were proposed. In all these works and most existing works, it was assumed that the conversion efficiency of the energy harvester is a fixed value that does not depend on the input power. However, this is not the case in reality. Thus, it is of great interest to study the realistic performances of the wireless systems by treating the conversion efficiency of the energy harvester as a function of the input power, as in practice.

In this paper, we study the realistic performances of the wireless systems under the assumption that the conversion efficiency of the energy harvester is a function of the input

power. To do this, we first derive a heuristic model for the conversion efficiency as a function of the input power. Using this, the realistic throughputs of relaying in [18] and wireless energy transfer in [17] are analyzed. Numerical results show that the realistic throughput depends on the specific energy harvesters considered, and it varies significantly when the conversion efficiency changes.

This work aims to find a more practical expression for the efficiency of existing harvesters and use it to evaluate the realistic performances of systems using existing harvesters. It focuses on the theoretical aspect of existing harvesters. To the best of the authors' knowledge, this has not been done before and thus, it represents contribution. To do this, it may be sufficient to use data from existing experiments in trusted sources. However, designing a new harvester or performing new experiments to collect new data could be an interesting future work when relevant laboratory resources are available.

## II. RELATED WORK ON RF ENERGY HARVESTER

This section does not aim to provide a complete review of all works on RF energy harvester designs due to limited space. For such a review, the readers are referred to the survey in [19]. Rather, this section aims to provide a discussion of some representative works, based on which a heuristic model of the conversion efficiency can be derived. Thus, we focus on [4] - [16].

### A. Low Input Power

It is desirable to have a RF energy harvester that can operate over a long distance at a low input power with high sensitivity. Reference [4] designed a RF energy harvester with a high sensitivity of  $-26.3$  dBm. It works at a frequency of  $868$  MHz with a long distance of  $25$  meters, when the source transmits at  $1.78$  W. In this case, the peak efficiency of this harvester is  $22\%$ . In [5], further improvements were made. In particular, the sensitivity was increased to  $-27$  dBm and hence the range was increased to  $27$  meters. The peak efficiency became  $36\%$ . Reference [6] designed a fully passive RFID tag with a sensitivity of  $-12$  dBm. Further, the peak efficiency of the harvester implemented in this tag is  $37\%$ . In [7], a  $953$  MHz rectenna was designed. It allows a peak efficiency of  $29\%$  achieved at  $-9.9$  dBm.

The above harvesters sacrificed efficiency for sensitivity and simplicity. In other works, the sensitivity was reduced or the complexity was increased to achieve higher efficiency. For example, in [8], an energy harvester with a peak efficiency of  $45\%$  but a reduced sensitivity of  $-14$  dBm was designed at a frequency of  $928$  MHz. This design has an efficiency

Yunfei Chen and Kalen Thomas Sabnis are with the School of Engineering, University of Warwick, Coventry, U.K. CV4 7AL (e-mail: Yunfei.Chen@warwick.ac.uk, K.Sabnis-Thomas@warwick.ac.uk)

Raed A. Abd-Alhameed is with the School of Engineering and Informatics, Bradford University, Bradford, U.K. BD7 1 DP (e-mail: R.A.A.Abd@bradford.ac.uk).

above 30% when the input power is between 0.1  $mW$  and 1.3  $mW$ . Further improvements were done in [9], where a peak efficiency of 60% with a sensitivity of -21  $dBm$  was achieved at 868  $MHz$ . The efficiency is above 30 % when the input power is between 0.05  $mW$  and 1.5  $mW$ . Such a wide range of input power is very useful, as the input power in practice is often unpredictable. Reference [10] designed a dual-band harvester at the GSM1800 band and 3G band to harvest energies from multiple bands. Tests showed that it has a peak efficiency of 51%, and its normal operating efficiency is between 16% and 43%. In [11], a 906  $MHz$  energy harvester was designed with a peak efficiency of 60% and a sensitivity of -22.5  $dBm$ . It can operate at a distance of 42 meters from a 4  $W$  power source. In [12], another GSM band harvester was designed that can achieve a peak efficiency of 67.5% using a differential drive technology. Further tests also showed that this harvester could be used for 500  $MHz$  DTV band to achieve a peak efficiency of 80%.

All the above designs operate at low input power and are suitable for long-range harvesting applications. Their peak efficiencies are normally achieved at less than 0.2  $mW$ .

### B. High Input Power

In this subsection, several designs operate at high input power are discussed. Their peak efficiencies are achieved at more than 0.2  $mW$ .

Reference [13] designed a 2.4 GHz energy harvester with a peak efficiency of 22.7% achieved at 0.5  $dBm$  and a sensitivity of -10  $dBm$ . In [14], another energy harvester at a frequency of 868  $MHz$  was designed for RFID and remote powering applications. This design aimed to maximize the range of the input power that provides high efficiency, in particular, an efficiency higher than 40% for a range of 14  $dB$  input power. This design has a peak efficiency of 60% achieved at 0.5  $mW$ . Reference [15] proposed a dual-rectifier energy harvester such that the overall range of input power with high efficiency was considerably increased. The harvester can achieve an efficiency above 30% for up to 30  $mW$ . It was tuned to 915  $MHz$  but can be modified to other frequencies too. It achieves a peak efficiency of 72 % at an input of 4  $mW$ . Finally, in [16], a RF energy harvester operating at 2.45  $GHz$  was designed. It can achieve an efficiency above 30% for up to 4  $mW$ . Its peak efficiency of 70% can be obtained at an input power of 1  $mW$ .

Table I shows the main parameters of the energy harvesters discussed above, where  $f_c$  is the operating frequency,  $\eta_{max}$  is the maximum achievable efficiency,  $P_{in}$  is the input power that achieves  $\eta_{max}$  and  $\epsilon$  is the sensitivity.

### C. Heuristic Model

The above papers have motivated us to obtain a heuristic model for the conversion efficiency as a function of the input power. After testing several different nonlinear functions in curve fitting, we conclude that the following rational function fits all the curves best using a minimum root mean squared error criterion as

$$\eta[x] = \frac{p_2 x^2 + p_1 x + p_0}{q_3 x^3 + q_2 x^2 + q_1 x + q_0} \quad (1)$$

TABLE I  
MAIN PARAMETERS OF DIFFERENT ENERGY HARVESTERS.

Ref.	$f_c$ (MHz)	$\eta_{max}$	$P_{in}$ (mW)	$\epsilon$ (dBm)	Fabrication
[4]	868	22%	0.015	-26.3	90 nm CMOS
[5]	868	36%	0.018	-27	90 nm CMOS
[6]	900	37%	0.16	-12	130 nm CMOS
[7]	953	29%	0.1	unknown	350 nm CMOS
[8]	928	45%	0.16	-14	130 nm CMOS
[9]	868	60%	0.15	-21	130 nm CMOS
[10]	1800 2200	51%	0.16	unknown	substrate $\epsilon_r = 2.33$
[11]	906	60%	0.16	-22.6	250 nm CMOS
[12]	953	68%	0.06	unknown	180 nm CMOS
[13]	2400	23%	0.5	-10	130 nm CMOS
[14]	868	58%	0.5	-17	130 nm CMOS
[15]	915	72%	4	unknown	substrate $\epsilon_r = 4.0$
[16]	2450	70%	1	unknown	substrate $\epsilon_r = 3.55$

where  $x$  is the input power with a unit of  $mW$ ,  $\eta$  is the efficiency as a percentage and the parameters of  $p_0, p_1, p_2, q_0, q_1, q_2, q_3$  are different for different harvesters. This is achieved by testing the order of numerator from 0 to 5 and the order of denominator from 1 to 5 for the rational function in MATLAB curve-fitting and choosing the orders for best tradeoff between accuracy and complexity. All these observations are made heuristically from existing experiments without any systematic analysis, as it is impossible to perform such an analysis for these complicated circuits. However, we have done this for 36 different harvesters, almost all existing harvesters in the literature, and they all follow this model. Thus, (1) does have generality. Moreover, it is true that curve-fitting is limited by the range considered. However, most existing harvesters operate with an input power below 4  $mW$ . In this case, our curve-fitting is useful for this small but practical range between 0 and 4  $mW$ . Some insights can also be gained from (1). For example, when the input power  $x$  is small, the efficiency is mainly determined by  $p_0/q_0$ . Also, when the input power  $x$  is large, the efficiency decreases at a rate  $1/x$  but is also determined by  $p_2/q_3$ . Figs. 1 and 2 compare the curve fitting results with the experimental results for the harvesters provided in [11] and [4], respectively. We did not reproduce the experimental results but only took them from the figures provided in the papers. One sees that they agree with each other reasonably well. Table II gives the fitting parameters for all the energy harvesters discussed above. The value of  $q_3$  is normalized to 1 and therefore is not listed in Table II.

## III. WIRELESS APPLICATIONS

In this section, we will use [17] and [18] as two examples to show the effect of varying efficiency. However, almost all existing energy harvesting wireless systems assume constant efficiency and therefore, will benefit from such an analysis. Due to the limited space of a correspondence item, other scenarios will not be discussed here but they will be considered in our future work, as some systems may be more sensitive to the varying efficiency than others and this difference could be quantized. In the following, the wireless channels are assumed to follow block Rayleigh fading, similar to what was assumed in [17] and [18].




Fig. 1. Comparison of the fitted curve and the experimental curve for [11].




Fig. 2. Comparison of the fitted curve and the experimental curve for [4].

#### A. Wireless relaying application

We consider the same system as [18] but with varying efficiency. In this case, a three-node relaying system is used, where the source sends information and energy to the relay and the relay uses the harvested energy to forward the information to the destination. There is no direct link. Each node has a single antenna and operates in half-duplex. The source-to-relay and relay-to-destination links are orthogonal in time. Assume that the total communication time is  $T$ .

In TS, a fraction of the total time  $\alpha T$  is used for energy harvesting at the relay, followed by  $(1 - \alpha)\frac{T}{2}$  for information reception at the relay and  $(1 - \alpha)\frac{T}{2}$  for information reception at the destination, where  $\alpha$  is the TS coefficient. In the existing analysis,  $\eta$  is assumed constant and independent of the input power. Thus, one has  $E_h = \eta P_s |h|^2 \alpha T$  as the harvested energy, where  $P_s$  is the source transmission power and  $h$  is the complex channel gain of the source-to-relay link. In this work and in reality,  $\eta$  is a function of the input power. By replacing  $\eta$  with (1) and following a similar analysis to [18], the outage probabilities can be derived as (2) for variable-gain relaying and (3) for fixed-gain relaying in the next page, where  $\gamma_0 = 2^R - 1$  is the threshold SNR for outage,  $R$  is the constant throughput required by the source,  $\Gamma_1 = \frac{P_s E\{|h|^2\}}{\sigma_{ra}^2 + \sigma_{rc}^2}$ ,

TABLE II  
FITTING PARAMETERS OF DIFFERENT ENERGY HARVESTERS.

Ref.	$p_2$	$p_1$	$p_0$	$q_2$	$q_1$	$q_0$
[4]	1.34	$5.2e-5$	$1.61e-6$	0.0547	-0.000318	$2.87e-6$
[5]	-5.15e5	1.16e5	-125	$5.35e4$	939	16.1
[6]	1.23	10.5	-0.238	-0.125	0.24	0.00045
[7]	14.1	0.171	-0.00284	0.956	-0.119	0.0069
[8]	108	1.47	-0.11	2.35	-0.0652	0.00923
[9]	85.3	19.4	-0.15	1.28	0.315	0.00023
[10]	$4.52e5$	$7.59e5$	685	$1.11e4$	$1.43e4$	73.1
[11]	78.5	-2.34	1.62	2.43	-0.482	0.0658
[12]	413	1160	704	15.1	25.4	12.5
[13]	230	-20.5	0.623	9.24	-0.77	0.0808
[14]	300	-12.7	0.135	4.4	-0.0104	-0.00166
[15]	0	$7.30e4$	394	-3.32	951	98
[16]	99.9	140	-0.059	-0.295	2.71	0.093

$\Gamma_2 = \frac{E\{|g|^2\}}{\sigma_{da}^2 + \sigma_{dc}^2}$ ,  $g$  is the complex channel gain of the relay-to-destination link,  $\sigma_{ra}^2$  and  $\sigma_{rc}^2$  are the variances of the noise at the relay from the RF antenna and RF-baseband conversion, respectively,  $\sigma_{da}^2$  and  $\sigma_{dc}^2$  are the variances of the noise at the destination from the RF antenna and RF-baseband conversion, respectively.

Finally, the throughput in this case is given by [18]

$$\beta_{TSVG}^{New} = \frac{R}{2}(1 - \alpha)(1 - P_{out-TSVG}^{New}) \quad (4)$$

$$\beta_{TSFG}^{New} = \frac{R}{2}(1 - \alpha)(1 - P_{out-TSFG}^{New}). \quad (5)$$

If PS is used, a fraction of the received signal is harvested without any dedicated harvesting time. In this case, the transmission from the source to the relay takes  $\frac{T}{2}$  seconds for both harvesting and reception and the relay takes another  $\frac{T}{2}$  seconds to use the harvested energy to transmit the signal to the destination. Using the varying efficiency in (1) and following a similar analysis to [18], the outage probabilities are (6) for variable-gain relaying and (7) for fixed-gain relaying in the next page, where  $\Gamma'_1 = \frac{P_s E\{|h|^2\}}{\sigma_{ra}^2 + \frac{\sigma_{rc}^2}{1-\rho}}$ .

Then, the throughput is given by [18]

$$\beta_{PSVG}^{New} = \frac{R}{2}(1 - P_{out-PSVG}^{New}) \quad (8)$$

$$\beta_{PSFG}^{New} = \frac{R}{2}(1 - P_{out-PSFG}^{New}). \quad (9)$$

Note that the results for fixed-gain relaying are new, as [18] did not consider fixed-gain.

#### B. Wireless energy transfer

In [17], the authors proposed a wireless energy transfer network. Using the same system model, we consider a network where the access point transmits energy to the nodes in the downlink for  $\tau_0 T$  seconds, and then the nodes use the harvested energy to transmit information to the access point in the uplink for  $\tau_1 T$  seconds,  $\tau_2 T$  seconds, and so on, in a time division multiple access (TDMA) way, where  $T$  is the total transmission time and  $\sum_i \tau_i = 1$ . In the existing analysis, one has  $E_i = \eta P_A h_i \tau_0 T$  as the harvested energy, where  $\eta$  is the constant conversion efficiency assumed in [17],  $P_A$  is the transmitted power of the access point,  $h_i$  is the fading

$$P_{out-TSVG}^{New} = 1 - \frac{e^{-\frac{\gamma_0}{\Gamma_1}}}{\Gamma_1} \int_0^\infty e^{-\frac{t}{\Gamma_1} - \frac{\gamma_0(1-\alpha)(t+\gamma_0+1)}{\Gamma_2(2\alpha)\eta[(t+\gamma_0)(\sigma_{ra}^2+\sigma_{rc}^2)](t+\gamma_0)(\sigma_{ra}^2+\sigma_{rc}^2)t}} dt \quad (2)$$

$$P_{out-TSFG}^{New} = 1 - \frac{e^{-\frac{\gamma_0}{\Gamma_1}}}{\Gamma_1} \int_0^\infty e^{-\frac{t}{\Gamma_1} - \frac{\gamma_0(1-\alpha)(\Gamma_1+1)}{\Gamma_2(2\alpha)\eta[(t+\gamma_0)(\sigma_{ra}^2+\sigma_{rc}^2)](t+\gamma_0)(\sigma_{ra}^2+\sigma_{rc}^2)t}} dt \quad (3)$$

$$P_{out-PSVG}^{New} = 1 - \frac{e^{-\frac{\gamma_0}{\Gamma'_1}}}{\Gamma'_1} \int_0^\infty e^{-\frac{t}{\Gamma'_1} - \frac{\gamma_0(t+\gamma_0+1)}{\Gamma_2\eta[\rho(t+\gamma_0)(\sigma_{ra}^2+\frac{\sigma_{rc}^2}{1-\rho})]\rho(t+\gamma_0)(\sigma_{ra}^2+\frac{\sigma_{rc}^2}{1-\rho})t}} dt \quad (6)$$

$$P_{out-PSFG}^{New} = 1 - \frac{e^{-\frac{\gamma_0}{\Gamma'_1}}}{\Gamma'_1} \int_0^\infty e^{-\frac{t}{\Gamma'_1} - \frac{\gamma_0(\Gamma'_1+1)}{\Gamma_2\eta[\rho(t+\gamma_0)(\sigma_{ra}^2+\frac{\sigma_{rc}^2}{1-\rho})]\rho(t+\gamma_0)(\sigma_{ra}^2+\frac{\sigma_{rc}^2}{1-\rho})t}} dt \quad (7)$$

power in the downlink from the access point to the node  $i$ ,  $\tau_0 T$  is the harvesting time. In this work and in practice, the conversion efficiency is a function of the input power such that  $E_i = \eta[P_A h_i]P_A h_i \tau_0 T$ , where (1) has been used. Following a similar analysis to [17] but using a varying efficiency, the average throughput becomes

$$\bar{R}_i = -\frac{\tau_i}{\Gamma \ln 2} \int_0^\infty e^{-\frac{y}{\Gamma} + \frac{\sigma^2 \tau_i}{\Gamma \tau_0 \eta [P_A y] P_A y}} E_i \left( -\frac{\sigma^2 \tau_i}{\Gamma \tau_0 \eta [P_A y] P_A y} \right) dy \quad (10)$$

where  $\sigma^2$  is the variance of the additive white Gaussian noise,  $\Gamma$  is the average fading power,  $E_i(\cdot)$  is the exponential integral defined in [20, eq. (8.211)] and the relationship in [20, eq. (4.337.2)] has been used.

#### IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, numerical examples are presented to show the performances of the wireless systems examined using the realistic assumption that the conversion efficiency is dependent of the input power. To do this, we set  $P_s = 1$ ,  $R = 3$ ,  $E\{|h|^2\} = E\{|g|^2\} = 1$  and  $\sigma_{ra}^2 = \sigma_{rc}^2 = \sigma_{da}^2 = \sigma_{dc}^2 = \sigma^2$  in the wireless relaying in [18],  $P_A = 1$ ,  $\Gamma = 1$ ,  $f_m T = 1$  in the wireless energy transfer in [17]. Also, for the existing analysis using constant conversion efficiency, we set  $\eta = 0.5$ . For our new analysis using varying conversion efficiency, we use the harvesters in [4] and [11]. Other constants and other harvesters can be examined in a similar way.

Fig. 3 shows the throughput for AF relaying using TS. Several observations can be made. First, there exists a maximum throughput in all the curves shown. However, the optimal TS coefficient is considerably different for different curves. This means that one cannot use the performances predicted by the analysis based on the assumption of constant conversion efficiency to set up the optimal TS coefficient in practice. This must be done by using the realistic assumption of varying conversion efficiency. Second, fixed-gain relaying and variable-gain relaying have different performances. In particular, from Fig. 3, the maximum throughput for fixed-gain relaying is smaller than that for variable-gain relaying. Third, the harvester in [4] has a peak efficiency of 22%. Thus, the curves using [4] have a very small throughput and therefore require a larger value of the optimal TS coefficient in order to harvest more energies. In all the considered cases, the constant




Fig. 3. Throughput vs.  $\alpha$  using AF relaying and TS when  $\sigma^2 = 0.01$ .




Fig. 4. Throughput vs.  $\rho$  using AF relaying and PS when  $\sigma^2 = 0.01$ .

conversion efficiency has larger throughput or overestimates the realistic throughput.

Fig. 4 shows the throughput for AF relaying using PS. In this case, the throughput for [4] is close to zero for all values of  $\rho$ . Again, there exists a maximum throughput in the curves. The optimal value of the PS factor for the harvester in [11] is considerably different from that assuming a constant conversion efficiency. In this case, fixed-gain relaying has a larger throughput than variable-gain relaying. Moreover, the




Fig. 5. Throughput vs.  $\tau_1$  with independent links when  $\sigma^2 = 0.01$ .

curves for [4] and [11] still have smaller maximum throughput and smaller optimal PS factor than those for the constant conversion efficiency.

Fig. 5 shows the average throughput for wireless energy transfer in [17]. Only one node is considered such that  $\tau_0 = 1 - \tau_1$ , where  $\tau_1$  is the transmission time of node 1. One sees that a maximum throughput exists in all curves, implying that it is necessary to choose the optimal value of the transmission time to achieve the highest throughput. Comparing the curve using the constant conversion efficiency with those using [11] and [4], one sees that they are significantly different. More specifically, the constant conversion efficiency always predicts a overly larger throughput.

## V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have discussed several RF energy harvester designs. Based on this discussion, a heuristic model that describes the conversion efficiency as a function of the input power has been derived. Using this model, two example harvesters have been used to analyze the realistic performances of wireless relaying and wireless energy transfer. Numerical results have shown that the realistic performances of wireless systems could be considerably different from what was predicted by the existing analysis. The novelty of this work lies in the derived heuristic model of efficiency and the realistic performances of the systems. However, using the varying efficiency in the analysis is quite straightforward by following the methods in [17] and [18]. Also, although the heuristic model is obtained by curve-fitting, it still provides some analytical insights. For example, it predicts the efficiency when the input power is very large or very small as well as the peak efficiency by finding the maximum of (1) using the first-order derivative.

## REFERENCES

- [1] X. Ge, H. Chen, M. Guizani, T. Han, "5G wireless backhaul networks: challenges and research advances," *IEEE Network*, vol. 28, pp. 6 - 11, Nov. 2014.
- [2] X. Ge, B. Yang, J. Ye, G. Mao, C.-X. Wang and T. Han, "Spatial spectrum and energy efficiency of random cellular networks," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 63, pp. 1019 - 1030, Mar. 2015.

- [3] S. Sudevalayam, and P. Kulkarni, "Energy harvesting sensor nodes: survey and implications," *IEEE Commun. Surveys and Tutorials*, vol. 13, pp. 443 - 461, Sept. 2011.
- [4] M. Stoopman, S. Keyrouz, H.J. Visser, K. Philips, W.A. Serdijn, "A self-calibrating RF energy harvester generating 1V at -26.3 dBm," *2013 Symposium on VLSI Circuits (VLSIC)*, pp. C226-C227, 2013.
- [5] M. Stoopman, S. Keyrouz, H.J. Visser, K. Philips, M.A. Serdijn, "Co-Design of a CMOS rectifier and small loop antenna for highly sensitive RF energy harvesters," *IEEE J. Solid-State Circuits*, vol. 49, pp. 622-634, 2014.
- [6] D. Yeager, F. Zhang, A. Zarrasvand, B.P. Otis, "A 9.2uA Gen 2 compatible UHF RFID sensing tag with -12dBm sensitivity and 1.25uVrms input-referred noise floor," *IEEE International Solid-State Circuits Conference Digest of Technical Papers (ISSCC) 2010*, pp. 52-53, 2010.
- [7] K. Kotani, and T. Ito, "High efficiency CMOS rectifier circuit with self-Vth cancellation and power regulation functions for UHF RFIDs," *IEEE Asian Solid-State Circuits Conference 2007*, pp. 119-122, 2007.
- [8] S. Scorcioni, L. Larcher, A. Bertacchini, "Optimised CMOS RF-DC converters for remote wireless powering of RFID applications," *2012 IEEE International Conference on RFID (RFID)*, pp. 47-53, 2012.
- [9] S. Scorcioni, L. Larcher, A. Bertacchini, "A reconfigurable differential CMOS RF energy scavenger with 60% peak efficiency and -21 dBm sensitivity," *IEEE Microwave and Wireless Components Letters*, vol. 23, pp. 155-157, 2013.
- [10] H. Sun, Y. Guo, M. He, Z. Zhong, "A dual band rectenna using broadband Yagi antenna array for ambient RF power harvesting," *IEEE Antennas and Wireless Propagation Letters*, vol. 12, pp. 918-921, 2013.
- [11] T. Le, K. Mayaram, T. Fiez, "Efficient far-field radio frequency energy harvesting for passively powered sensor networks," *IEEE J. Solid-State Circuits*, vol. 43, pp. 1287-1302, 2008.
- [12] K. Kotani, A. Sasaki, T. Ito, "High-efficiency differential-drive CMOS rectifier for UHF RFIDs," *IEEE J. Solid-State Circuits*, vol. 44, pp. 3011-3018, 2009.
- [13] J. Masuch, M. Delgado-Restituto, D. Milosevic, P. Baltus, "An RF-to-DC energy harvester for co-integration in a low power 2.4GHz transceiver frontend," *IEEE International Symposium on Circuits and Systems (ISCAS) 2012*, pp. 680-683, 2012.
- [14] S. Scorcioni, L. Larcher, A. Bertacchini, "A 868MHz CMOS RF-DC power converter with -17dBm input power sensitivity and efficiency higher than 40% over 14dB input range," *2012 ESSCIRC*, pp. 109-112, 2012.
- [15] P. Nintanavongsa, U. Muncuk, D.R. Lewis, K.R. Chowdhury, "Design optimisation and implementation for RF energy harvesting circuits," *IEEE J. Emerging and Selected Topics in Circuits and Systems*, vol. 2, pp. 24-33, 2012.
- [16] B.R. Franciscatto, "High-efficiency rectifier circuit at 2.45 GHz for low-input-power RF energy harvesting," *2013 European Microwave Conference (EuMC)*, pp. 507-510, 2013.
- [17] H. Ju, R. Zhang, "Throughput maximization in wireless powered communication networks," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 13, pp. 418 - 428, Jan. 2014.
- [18] A.A. Nasir, X. Zhou, S. Durrani, R.A. Kennedy, "Relaying protocols for wireless energy harvesting and information processing," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 12, pp. 3622 -3636, July 2013.
- [19] X. Lu, P. Wang, D. Niyato, D.I. Kim, Z. Han, "Wireless networks with RF energy harvesting: a contemporary survey," *IEEE Commun. Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 17, pp. 757 - 789, 2015.
- [20] I. S. Gradshteyn and I. M. Ryzhik. *Table of Integrals, Series, and Products*. Academic, New York, 6 edition, 2000.